

## AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

*Please amend the Claims as follows:*

1. (Original) A computer-based method ~~for to perform query optimization by~~ automatically finding and exploiting hidden, fuzzy algebraic constraints in a database, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) constructing one or more candidates of form  $C=(a_1, a_2, P, \oplus)$ , wherein  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are numerical attributes associated with column values of data in said database,  $P$  is a pairing rule, and  $\oplus$  is any of the following algebraic operators: +, -,  $\times$ , or /;

(b) constructing, for each candidate identified in (a), an algebraic constraint  $AC=(a_1, a_2, P, \oplus, I_1, \dots, I_k)$  by applying ~~any of, or a combination of the following techniques to a sample of column values: statistical histogramming, a segmentation, or clustering technique~~, where  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  is a set of disjoint intervals and  $k \geq 1$ , said step of constructing algebraic constraint further comprising the steps of:

constructing a sample set  $W_C$  of an induced set  $\Omega_C$ , wherein  $P$  is a join predicate between tables  $R$  and  $S$  and  $\Omega_C = \{r.a_1 \oplus r.a_2 : r \in R\}$  when the pairing rule  $P$  is a trivial rule  $\theta_R$  and  
 $\Omega_C = \{r.a_1 \oplus s.a_2 : r \in R, s \in S, \text{and } (r, s) \text{ satisfies } P\};$

sorting  $n$  data points in said sampled set  $W_C$  in increasing order as  $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n$  and constructing a set of disjoint intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  such that data in sample  $W_C$  falls within one of said disjoint intervals, wherein segmentation for constructing said set of disjoint intervals is specified via a vector of indices  $(i(1),$

$i(2), \dots, i(k)$  and the  $j^{\text{th}}$  interval is given by  $I_j = [x_{i(j-1)+1}, x_{i(j)}]$  and length of  $I_j$ , denoted by  $L_j$ , is given by  $L_j = x_{i(j)} - x_{i(j-1)+1}$ ; and

wherein the function for optimizing cost associated with said segmentation is

$$c(S) = wk + (1-w) \left[ \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{j=1}^k L_j \right] \text{ with } w \text{ being a fixed weight between 0 and 1 and a}$$

segmentation that minimizes  $c$  is defined by placing adjacent points  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$  in the same segment if and only if  $x_{i+1} - x_i < d^*$ , where  $d^* = \Delta(w/(1-w))$ , and

wherein said constructed algebraic constraints are used in query optimization.

2. (Original) A compute-based method as per claim 1, wherein one or more pruning rules are used to limit said number of constructed candidates.

3. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 2, wherein said pairing rule  $P$  represents either a trivial pairing rule  $\theta_R$  or a join between tables  $R$  and  $S$  and said pruning rules comprise any of, or a combination of the following:

pairing rule  $P$  is of form  $R.a = S.b$  or of the form  $\theta_{R_s}$ , and the number of rows in either table  $R$  or table  $S$  lies below a specified threshold value;

pairing rule  $P$  is of form  $R.a = S.b$  with  $a \in K$  and the number of distinct values in  $S.b$  divided by the number of values in  $R.a$  lies below a specified threshold value, wherein  $K$  is a set comprising key-like columns among all columns in said database;

pairing rule  $P$  is of form  $R.a = S.b$ , and one or both of  $R$  and  $S$  fails to have an index on any of its columns; or

pairing rule  $P$  is of form  $R.a = S.b$  with  $a \in K$ , and  $S.b$  is a system-generated key.

4. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 1, wherein said method further comprises the steps of:

identifying a set of useful algebraic constraints via one or more pruning rules; and  
partitioning data into compliant data and exception data.

5. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 4, wherein said method further comprises the steps of:

receiving a query;  
modifying said query to incorporate identified constraints; and  
combining results of modified query executed on data in said database and said original query executed on exception data.

6. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 4, wherein said partitioning is done by incrementally maintained materialized views, partial indices, or physical partitioning of the table.

7. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 2, wherein said pruning rules comprise any of, or a combination of the following:

$a_1$  and  $a_2$  are not comparable data types;  
the fraction of NULL values in either  $a_1$  or  $a_2$  exceeds a specified threshold; or  
either column  $a_1$  or  $a_2$  is not indexed.

8. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 1, wherein said step of constructing one or more candidates further comprises the steps of:

generating a set  $P$  of pairing rules; and

for each pairing rule  $P \in \mathbb{P}$ , systematically considering possible attribute pairs  $(a_1, a_2)$  and operators  $\oplus$  with which to construct candidates.

9. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 8, wherein said step of generating a set  $\mathbb{P}$  of pairing rules further comprises the steps of:

initializing  $\mathbb{P}$  to be an empty set;

adding a trivial pairing rule of the form  $\emptyset_R$  to said set  $\mathbb{P}$  for each table  $R$  in said database;

and

generating and adding nontrivial pairing rules to said set  $\mathbb{P}$  based upon identifying matching columns via an inclusion dependency, wherein a column  $b$  is considered a match for column  $a$  if:

data in columns  $a$  and  $b$  are of a comparable type; or

either (i) column  $a$  is a declared primary key and column  $b$  is a declared foreign key for the primary key, or (ii) every data value in a sample from column  $b$  has a matching value in column  $a$ .

10. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 8, wherein said step of generating a set  $\mathbb{P}$  of pairing rules further comprises the steps of:

initializing  $\mathbb{P}$  to be an empty set;

adding a trivial pairing rule of the form  $\emptyset_R$  to said set  $\mathbb{P}$  for each table  $R$  in said database;

and

generating a set  $K$  of key-like columns from among all columns in said database with each column in set  $K$  belonging to a predefined set of types  $T$ , said set  $K$  comprising declared

primary key columns, declared unique key columns, and undeclared key columns, wherein said primary keys or declared unique keys are compound keys of form  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in T^m$  for  $m > 1$ ;

adding nontrivial pairing rules to said set  $P$  based upon identifying matching compound columns via an inclusion dependency wherein, given a compound key  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in K$ , a compound column  $b$  is considered a component wise match for compound column  $a$  if:

data in compound columns  $a$  and  $b$  are of a comparable type; or

either (i) compound column  $a$  is a declared primary key and compound column  $b$  is a declared foreign key for the primary key, or (ii) every data value in a sample from compound column  $b$  has a matching value in compound column  $a$ .

11. (Cancelled)

12. (Currently Amended) A computer-based method as per ~~claim 11~~ claim 1, wherein widths associated with said intervals are expanded to avoid additional sampling required to increase right end point to equal maximum value in  $\Omega_C$ .

13. (Currently Amended) A computer-based method as per ~~claim 11~~ claim 1, wherein size of said sampled set is approximated via the following iterative steps:

(a) given a  $k$ -segmentation, setting counters  $i=1$  and  $k=1$ ;

(b) selecting a sample size  $n=n^*$ , wherein  $n^*(k) \approx \frac{\chi^2_{1-p}(2-f)}{4f} + \frac{k}{2}$ , wherein  $p$  is the

probability that at least a fraction of points in  $\Omega_C$  that lie outside the intervals is at most  $f$ ;

(c) obtaining a sample based on (b), computing algebraic constraints, and identifying a number  $k'$  of bump intervals; and

(d) if  $n \geq n^*(k')$  or  $i = i_{max}$ , then utilizing sample size in (b); else setting counters  $k=k'$  and  $i=i+1$ , and returning to step (b).

14. (Cancelled).

15. (Cancelled).

16. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 1, wherein said method is implemented across networks.

17. (Original) A computer-based method as per claim 16, wherein said across networks element comprises any of, or a combination of the following: local area network (LAN), wide area network (WAN), or the Internet.

18. (Cancelled).

19. (Cancelled).

20. (Cancelled).

21. (Cancelled).

22. (Currently Amended) An article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied therein which implements a method to perform query optimization by ~~for~~-automatically finding and exploiting hidden, fuzzy algebraic constraints in a database, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) computer readable program code constructing one or more candidates of form  $C=(a_1, a_2, P, \oplus)$ , wherein  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are numerical attributes associated with column values of data in said database,  $P$  is a pairing rule, and  $\oplus$  is any of the following algebraic operators:  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $\times$ , or  $/$ ;

(b) computer readable program code constructing, for each candidate identified in (a), an algebraic constraint  $AC=(a_1, a_2, P, \oplus, I_1, \dots, I_k)$  by applying ~~any of, or a combination of the following techniques to a sample of column values: statistical histogramming, a segmentation technique, or clustering~~, where  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  is a set of disjoint intervals and  $k \geq 1$ , said step of constructing algebraic constraint further comprising the steps of:

constructing a sample set  $W_C$  of an induced set  $\Omega_C$ , wherein  $P$  is a join predicate between tables  $R$  and  $S$  and  $\Omega_C = \{r.a_1 \oplus r.a_2 : r \in R\}$  when the pairing rule  $P$  is a trivial rule  $\emptyset_R$  and  
 $\Omega_C = \{r.a_1 \oplus s.a_2 : r \in R, s \in S, \text{ and } (r,s) \text{ satisfies } P\}$ ;

sorting  $n$  data points in said sampled set  $W_C$  in increasing order as  $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n$  and constructing a set of disjoint intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  such that data in sample  $W_C$  falls within one of said disjoint intervals, wherein segmentation for constructing said set of disjoint intervals is specified via a vector of indices  $(i(1), i(2), \dots, i(k))$  and the  $j^{\text{th}}$  interval is given by  $I_j=[x_{(i(j)-1)+1}, x_{(i(j))}]$  and length of  $I_j$ , denoted by  $L_j$ , is given by  $L_j = x_{(i(j))} - x_{(i(j)-1)+1}$ ; and

wherein the function for optimizing cost associated with said segmentation is

$c(S) = wk + (1-w) \left[ \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{j=1}^k L_j \right]$  with  $w$  being a fixed weight between 0 and 1 and a segmentation

that minimizes  $c$  is defined by placing adjacent points  $x_l$  and  $x_{l+1}$  in the same segment if and only if  $x_{l+1} - x_l < d^*$ , where  $d^* = \Delta(w/(l-w))_l$ , and

wherein said constructed algebraic constraints are used in query optimization.

23. (Original) An article of manufacture as per claim 22, wherein said medium further comprises:

computer readable program code identifying a set of useful algebraic constraints via heuristics comprising a set of pruning rules; and

computer readable program code partitioning data into compliant data and exception data.

24. (Original) An article of manufacture as per claim 23, wherein said medium further comprises:

computer readable program code aiding in receiving a query;

computer readable program code modifying said query to incorporate identified constraints; and

computer readable program code combining results of modified query executed on data in said database and said original query executed on exception data.

Please cancel claims 25-38.